

projects at Gettysburg National Military Park by restoring approximately 27 acres of battlefield to its 1863 appearance. This act will help preserve the hallowedness of the ground by relocating 12 monuments to their original locations, where the veterans themselves placed these monuments several generations ago. Visitors to Gettysburg will benefit from increased educational programming at both the Army Heritage and Education Center and the Gettysburg Battle Visitor Center as the act helps facilitate the continued expansion of the Army Heritage and Education Center and construction of the Army Heritage Museum, both of which are dedicated "to telling the Army story . . . one Soldier at a time."

The importance of the 1863 Campaign in Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg, and Lincoln's address stretch well beyond the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and stand as an enduring reminder of how our nation was reborn out of the Civil War as a stronger Union more dedicated to its ideals of freedom and liberty. I urge each of my colleagues to join Senator CASEY and myself in supporting this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 415—CALLING FOR A RENEWED FOCUS ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN'S VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONALLY-RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS AS FOUND IN THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KAUFMAN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. KERRY) submitted the following resolution, which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 415

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has violated international standards for human rights by using violence to disperse peaceful assemblies by its own citizens;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran suppressed peaceful commemorations by members of Iran's Green Movement at the anniversary of Iran's Islamic revolution on February 11, 2010;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran's sustained campaign of violence against Iranian citizens who have peacefully protested the irregularities in the flawed Iranian presidential elections of June 12, 2009 has demonstrated to the world that the present Iranian regime is fully capable of widespread violence against its own citizens;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran currently has 65 journalists and bloggers imprisoned, more than any single country in the world, according to Reporters Without Borders and in the past week arrested 10 journalists;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has restricted access to the internet, including its recent announcement to permanently block Google's Gmail service;

Whereas Iranian citizens' right to due process has been violated, with the judiciary detaining government critics and religious

minorities, and ordering executions of peaceful demonstrators;

Whereas the use of arbitrary detention and the infliction of cruel and degrading punishments by the Iranian authorities are in direct violation of Articles 7, 9 and 10 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) as well as Articles 22 (the right to human dignity), 36 (Sentencing in accordance with the law), 38 (prohibition of torture) and 39 (the rights of arrested persons) of the Iranian Constitution.

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States:

(1) Pays tribute to the courageous advocates for democracy and human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran who are engaged in peaceful efforts to encourage democratic reform;

(2) notes that it is the right of the people of the Islamic Republic of Iran to peacefully assemble and to express their opinions and aspirations without intimidation, repression, and violence;

(3) supports freedom of speech in the Islamic Republic of Iran as elsewhere and the ability of journalists and bloggers to report without repression by government authorities;

(4) desires that the men and women of Iran be able to enjoy due process in the Iranian judicial system including the right to a fair trial;

(5) expresses serious concern over the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran's brutal suppression of its citizens through censorship, imprisonment, and continued acts of violence;

(6) denounces the atmosphere of impunity in the Islamic Republic of Iran for those who employ intimidation, harassment, or violence to restrict and suppress freedom of speech, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press;

(7) urges the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to fully observe the ICCPR, which has been ratified by the Islamic Republic of Iran and states, "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice".

(8) calls upon the Islamic Republic of Iran to abide by the resolutions adopted by the U.N. General Assembly, in particular the resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran of December 2009;

(9) communicates deep concern that, despite the Islamic Republic of Iran's standing invitation to all thematic special procedures mandate holders, it has not fulfilled any requests from those special mechanisms to visit the country in four years and has not answered numerous communications from those special mechanisms, and strongly urges the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to fully cooperate with the special mechanisms, especially the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances;

(10) encourages the U.N. Human Rights Council to fully examine these issues during its Universal Periodic Review of the Islamic Republic of Iran on February 15, 2010.

SENATE RESOLUTION 416—AMENDING THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE TO PROVIDE FOR CLOTURE TO BE INVOKED WITH LESS THAN A THREE-FIFTHS MAJORITY AFTER ADDITIONAL DEBATE

Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 416

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENATE CLOTURE MODIFICATION.

Paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"2. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of rule II or rule IV or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer, or clerk at the direction of the Presiding Officer, shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the clerk call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yeay-and-nay vote the question: 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?' And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn—except on a measure or motion to amend the Senate rules, in which case the necessary affirmative vote shall be two-thirds of the Senators present and voting—then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be proposed after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless it had been submitted in writing to the Journal Clerk by 1 o'clock p.m. on the day following the filing of the cloture motion if an amendment in the first degree, and unless it had been so submitted at least one hour prior to the beginning of the cloture vote if an amendment in the second degree. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"After no more than thirty hours of consideration of the measure, motion, or other matter on which cloture has been invoked, the Senate shall proceed, without any further debate on any question, to vote on the final disposition thereof to the exclusion of all amendments not then actually pending before the Senate at that time and to the exclusion of all motions, except a motion to table, or to reconsider and one quorum call on demand to establish the presence of a quorum (and motions required to establish a quorum) immediately before the final vote begins. The thirty hours may be increased by the adoption of a motion, decided without

debate, by a three-fifths affirmative vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, and any such time thus agreed upon shall be equally divided between and controlled by the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees. However, only one motion to extend time, specified above, may be made in any one calendar day.

"If, for any reason, a measure or matter is reprinted after cloture has been invoked, amendments which were in order prior to the reprinting of the measure or matter will continue to be in order and may be conformed and reprinted at the request of the amendment's sponsor. The conforming changes must be limited to lineation and pagination.

"No Senator shall call up more than two amendments until every other Senator shall have had the opportunity to do likewise.

"Notwithstanding other provisions of this rule, a Senator may yield all or part of his one hour to the majority or minority floor managers of the measure, motion, or matter or to the Majority or Minority Leader, but each Senator specified shall not have more than two hours so yielded to him and may in turn yield such time to other Senators.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this rule, any Senator who has not used or yielded at least ten minutes, is, if he seeks recognition, guaranteed up to ten minutes, inclusive, to speak only.

"After cloture is invoked, the reading of any amendment, including House amendments, shall be dispensed with when the proposed amendment has been identified and has been available in printed form at the desk of the Members for not less than twenty-four hours.

"(b)(1) If, upon a vote taken on a motion presented pursuant to subparagraph (a), the Senate fails to invoke cloture with respect to a measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, subsequent motions to bring debate to a close may be made with respect to the same measure, motion, matter, or unfinished business. It shall not be in order to file subsequent cloture motions on any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, except by unanimous consent, until the previous motion has been disposed of.

"(2) Such subsequent motions shall be made in the manner provided by, and subject to the provisions of, subparagraph (a), except that the affirmative vote required to bring to a close debate upon that measure, motion, or other matter, or unfinished business (other than a measure or motion to amend Senate rules) shall be reduced by three votes on the second such motion, and by three additional votes on each succeeding motion, until the affirmative vote is reduced to a number equal to or less than an affirmative vote of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn. The required vote shall then be an affirmative vote of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn. The requirement of an affirmative vote of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn shall not be further reduced upon any vote taken on any later motion made pursuant to this subparagraph with respect to that measure, motion, matter, or unfinished business."

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this past week, New York Times columnist Gail Collins noted that "Washington was immobilized by snow on Friday. This is highly unusual. Normally, Washington is immobilized by senators."

Sadly, Gail Collins is right. The unprecedented abuse of Senate rules by Republicans has overwhelmed the legislative process. The same week that Washington saw a large snow storm

shut down the city and close the Federal Government, we saw the unprecedented action of a minority blocking Senate confirmation of every single executive branch nominee. Last week, we saw Republicans require the Senate to debate for 30 hours one Department of Labor nominee in lieu of conducting other business and I use the term "debate" generously since during that time one Member spoke in opposition to her confirmation. This Congress, we have seen the minority require the Senate clerk to read lengthy bills out loud. And, most significantly, the minority has used the filibuster at an unheard of level in the history of this body.

The U.S. Senate cannot continue to function this way. That is why today I am introducing a bill to change the Standing Rules of the Senate to reform the cloture procedure in the U.S. Senate. I am introducing this bill as a member of the majority party in the Senate. I note, however, that this bill is identical to the one I first introduced in 1995, when I was a member of the minority party in the Senate. So this legislation is not about one party or the other gaining an advantage. It is about the Senate as an institution operating more fairly, effectively, and democratically.

I will explain the details of my proposal shortly. But first I would like to provide some historical background.

In 1995, for the first time in 8 years I found myself a member of the minority party in the Senate. At the beginning of that Congress, although Republicans outnumbered Democrats 53 to 47, I introduced legislation to change the Senate rules regarding the filibuster. My plan would have ensured ample debate and deliberation—the original purpose of the filibuster—but it would have allowed a bill, over time, to be passed by a simple majority vote. Unfortunately, my proposal did not pass.

In the intervening years, it has become even more apparent that for our government to properly function, we must reform and curb the use of the filibuster.

I readily acknowledge, changing the Senate rules is a tall order; and my goal is not to change the rules halfway through the 111th Congress. Instead, it is to lay down a marker and to focus attention on the unprecedented level of obstruction that occurs in the Senate today. The sad reality is that, today, because of the promiscuous use of the filibuster, the ability of our government to legislate and to address problems is severely jeopardized.

The filibuster was once an extraordinary tool used in the rarest of instances. When many people think of the filibuster they think of the climax of the classic film "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," when Jimmy Stewart's character singlehandedly uses a filibuster to stop a corrupt piece of legislation favored by special interests.

The reality is that in 1939, the year "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" was

filmed, there were zero filibusters in this body. In the 1950s, there was an average of just one filibuster per Congress.

Yet, over the past half century, the use of this device has grown exponentially. The concerns I raise today are not new. The problem, however, has become far more serious.

In 1982, my good friend and colleague Senator Dale Bumpers of Arkansas said this about procedures like the filibuster:

Unless we recognize that things are out of control and procedures have to be changed, we'll never be an effective legislative body again.

During the 2 years of that Congress, the 97th, there were 31 filibusters, as measured by the number of cloture motions filed.

In 1985, former Senator Thomas Eagleton of Missouri remarked:

The Senate is now in the state of incipient anarchy. The filibuster, once used, by and large, as an occasional exercise in civil rights matters, has now become a routine frolic in almost all matters. Whereas our rules were devised to guarantee full and free debate, they now guarantee unbridled chaos.

During that Congress, the 99th, there were 40 filibusters.

In 1994, former Senator Charles Mathias of Maryland said:

Today, filibusters are far less visible but far more frequent. The filibuster has become an epidemic used whenever a coalition can find 41 votes to oppose legislation. The distinction between voting against legislation and blocking a vote, between opposing and obstructing, has nearly disappeared.

During that Congress, the 103rd, right before I first introduced legislation to modify the filibuster, there were 80 filibusters.

Remarkably, from 1995 through 2008, the number of filibusters per Congress has increased 75 percent. In the last Congress, the 110th Congress, there were an astonishing 139 motions to end filibusters.

In the current 111th Congress, now near its midpoint, there have been 74. Last year alone, in one year—2009—there were 67 filibusters. In just 1 year, Republicans tripled the amount of filibusters that occurred in the entire 20-year period between 1950 and 1969.

I would also point out that, according to a study by UCLA Professor Barbara Sinclair, in the 1960s, just 8 percent of major bills were subject to a filibuster. In the last Congress, 70 percent of major bills were targeted.

The simple fact is that, today, rather than an unusual event, the filibuster, or the threat of a filibuster, has become a routine occurrence. Let me repeat these figures. In the 1950s, an average of one bill was filibustered in each Congress. In the 104th Congress, when Democrats were in the minority, there were 82 filibusters. In the last Congress, 139 bills were filibustered. In the current Congress, there have already been 74 filibusters.

What was once a procedure used very rarely and judiciously has become an almost daily procedure used routinely and often recklessly.

A quarter century ago, faced with 40 filibusters in the course of one Congress, Senator Eagleton remarked that the Senate was in a situation of “unbridled chaos.”

Sixteen years ago, faced with 80 filibusters in one Congress, Senator Matthias warned that the Senate was facing an “epidemic.”

In this Congress, we are on pace to far surpass those earlier numbers. At the current pace, we will face approximately 140 filibusters in the 111th Congress. It is no accident that Norm Ornstein, the esteemed Congressional scholar, wrote an article in 2008 titled “Our Broken Senate.”

And, it is not just scholars. Editorials throughout the country have recognized that the use of the filibuster must be changed. The Newark Star-Ledger called the filibuster a “rule that cripples our democracy.” The San Jose Mercury News recently noted that the “Senate’s abuse of filibuster rule threatens democracy.” The Sacramento Bee wrote that it is “time to bust up [the] filibuster.”

The extraordinary number of filibusters by Republicans are not just statistics. Behind each filibuster is an attempt by Republicans to block the majority from passing legislation and confirming nominees to help everyday working Americans.

In the 71 years since Hollywood filmed “Mr. Smith Goes to Washington,” the aim of the filibuster has been turned completely upside down. Seven decades ago, Jimmy Stewart, “Senator Smith,” was the little guy using the filibuster to battle the special interests. Today, it is the special interests that are using the filibuster to kill legislation that would benefit the little guy.

What is particularly striking, moreover, is not just the sheer number of filibusters today. It is the fact that this once rare tactic—what was once a dramatic challenge to majority rule only used in extraordinary circumstances—is now used or threatened to be used on virtually every measure and every nominee. To quote Norm Ornstein:

The Senate has taken the term “deliberative” to a new level, slowing not just contentious legislation but also bills that have overwhelming support.

For example, late last year, the Republicans filibustered a motion to proceed to the Defense Appropriations bill for the sole purpose to delay a vote on health care reform. In other words, Republicans risked denying our troops the resources they need at a time of war for no other purpose than to delay the Senate. After a filibuster and delay, the bill passed 88 to 10.

The Republicans filibustered a motion to proceed to a bill to extend unemployment compensation. After delaying and then grinding Senate business to a halt, the bill passed 97 to 1. In other words, Republicans filibustered a bill they fully intended to support, simply in order to stall or stop business in the Senate.

Similarly, the Republicans filibustered the agriculture appropriations bill that funded key agriculture, conservation, and nutrition programs. That bill passed 84 to 11.

The Republicans filibustered the Credit Card Holders Bill of Rights. That bill passed 92 to 2.

The Republicans filibustered the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act. That bill passed 84 to 4.

As the Defense Appropriations bill and unemployment compensation bill examples show, in many cases Republicans have filibustered motions to proceed. This is truly remarkable. In fact, last Congress there were over 50 filibusters of motions to proceed to consider bills. Republicans filibustered efforts for this body to consider efforts to provide low-income home energy assistance, efforts to strengthen the Consumer Product Safety Commission to ensure our children are not exposed to unsafe toys, and efforts to ensure women are guaranteed equal pay for equal work. In all of these cases and many others, Republicans objected to this body even bringing up for debate and deliberation important issues that matter to the American people.

There is absolutely no purpose to filibuster a motion to proceed except delay and obstruction. If one does not like a piece of legislation, one has an opportunity to offer amendments to try to improve the measure. But one cannot do that if the Senate is prevented from even considering a bill.

One of the most striking features of the abuse of this extraordinary tool by Republicans is how quickly it has become accepted that literally any legislation needs 60 votes to pass the Senate. If 41 senators do not like a bill, it does not get a vote. Newspapers and pundits regularly pronounce that 60 votes are “needed to pass the bill”, even as we all know, only 51 Senators are, in fact, needed.

So accepted is this extraordinary abuse by the minority, that after the most recent election in Massachusetts, the media regularly pronounced that Democrats going from a 20-seat majority to an 18-seat majority was the equivalent to losing majority status. A Philadelphia Metro newspaper headline asked: “How will Dems recover after losing majority?” CNN reported: “Brown’s election tips Senate balance of power to GOP.” The New York Times reported that “Brown’s Senate win has cost them their razor-thin advantage.” One paper, the Village Voice, even wrote satirically, “Scott Brown wins Mass. Race, Giving GOP 41–59 Majority in the Senate.” When the rules are abused in such a manner that a majority of 18 seats is now treated as the equivalent to being in the minority, it is time to change the rules.

This is not how it is supposed to be. To be sure, the Founders put in place a system of checks and balances that made it difficult to enact legislation. A bill must pass in both Houses of Congress. It is then subject to the Presi-

dent’s veto power. A law can be challenged in court. These are all very significant checks.

What was never intended, however, was that a supermajority of 60 votes would be needed to enact virtually any piece of legislation. Indeed, the Framers of the Constitution were very clear about circumstances where a supermajority is required. There were only five: ratification of a treaty, override of a veto, votes of impeachment, passage of a constitutional amendment, and the expulsion of a Member.

James Madison specifically rejected the idea that more than a majority would be needed for decisions. Responding to anti-Federalist arguments that the Constitution should have required more than a majority, Madison argued that such rules would lead to minority rule, something inconsistent with fundamental republican principles. As he wrote in Federalist No. 58:

That some advantages might have resulted from such a precaution, cannot be denied. It might have been an additional shield to some particular interests, and another obstacle generally to hasty and partial measures. But these considerations are outweighed by the inconveniences in the opposite scale. In all cases where justice or the general good might require new laws to be passed, or active measures to be pursued, the fundamental principle of free government would be reversed. It would no longer be the majority that would rule; the power would be transferred to the minority.

James Madison would be appalled by the current abuse of the filibuster to impose minority rule.

Proponents of the filibuster regularly quote the oft told story of George Washington’s description of the Senate to Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson had returned from France and was breakfasting with Washington. Jefferson asked Washington why he agreed to have a Senate. “Why,” asked Washington, “did you just now pour that coffee into your saucer before drinking it?” “To cool it,” said Jefferson. “Even so,” said Washington, “we pour our legislation into the Senatorial saucer to cool it.”

As one author recently noted, however, the increasing use of the filibuster has converted the Senate from the “saucer” George Washington intended, in which scalding ideas from the more passionate House of Representatives might “cool” into a “deep freeze and a dead weight.”

At issue is a fundamental principle of our democracy—rule of the majority in a legislative body. As Alexander Hamilton noted in the Federalist Papers, “The fundamental maxim of republican government . . . requires that the sense of the majority should prevail.”

Mr. President, elections should have consequences. My feeling in 1995 was that if the Nation elects a majority of Republicans to the Senate, as it did, then after the minority has an opportunity to make its case, the majority should prevail. And, it should be the same when the people send a majority

of Democrats to the Senate. If the people do not like how the majority is governing, then they have the ability to change the composition of the Senate at the next election.

Fifteen months ago, a sizable majority of voters sent Democrats to Washington to implement real change and reform. It is no surprise that people are now frustrated. Largely, because of the filibuster their hopes for change have been frustrated. Instead, the public sees nothing but gridlock.

Because of Senate rules, a minority as small as one Senator can block action by the majority. Even when a party is resoundingly repudiated at the polls, that party retains the power, thanks to the filibuster, to prevent the majority from legislating and effectively governing. Regrettably, the filibuster has become a bludgeon that the minority uses to thwart the will of the majority, to mire the Senate in procedural impasses and repeatedly to hold the entire Senate hostage for extended periods of time. Today, even simple, noncontroversial bills and nominations are not permitted to come to a vote. This is wrong. As a result of the filibuster, the legislative process itself has been overwhelmed.

The legislation I introduce today would amend the Standing Rules of the Senate to permit a decreasing majority of Senators to invoke cloture on a given matter. On the first cloture vote, 60 votes would be needed to end debate. If the motion does not get 60 votes, a Senator can file another cloture motion and two days later have another vote; that vote would require 57 votes to end debate. If cloture is not obtained, a Senator can file another cloture motion and wait two more days; in that vote, 54 votes would be required to end debate. If cloture is still not obtained, a Senator could file one more cloture motion, wait 2 more days, and—at that point—just 51 votes would be needed to move to the merits of the bill.

Let me be clear, this proposal has absolutely nothing to do with limiting minority rights. Under this proposal, a determined minority could slow down any bill. In this way, proper deliberation is ensured. Senators would have ample time to make their arguments and attempt to persuade the public and a majority of colleagues. However, a minority of members would no longer be able to stymie the majority by grinding the Senate to a halt, as sadly too regularly happens today.

Mr. President, this is hardly radical legislation. There are currently numerous rules and laws that forbid the filibuster in numerous circumstances. For example, we cannot filibuster a federal budget resolution. We cannot filibuster a resolution authorizing the use of force. We cannot filibuster international trade agreements. We cannot filibuster a reconciliation bill.

Reform of the filibuster should not be a Democrat or Republican issue. Indeed, it was the former Republican Ma-

jority Leader Bill Frist who said when he nearly shut this body down over the use of filibusters: "This filibuster is nothing less than a formula for tyranny by the minority."

A majority in this body—whether Democratic Senators, Republican Senators, or a bipartisan coalition of Senators—should be allowed to work its will. When a given party wins the Presidency and both houses of Congress by significant margins, that party should be allowed to carry out its agenda, and then should be held accountable in the next election.

But, I do not see how we can effectively govern a 21st century superpower when a minority of just 41 senators can dictate action—or inaction—not just to the majority of senators but to a majority of the American people. This is all the more true when you consider that those 41 senators could come from small states and represent as little as 15 percent of the American population. This is not democratic. Certainly, it is not the kind of democracy envisioned and intended by our Founders. Instead, it is a sure-fire formula for national paralysis, drift, and decline.

I urge my colleagues to join me in restoring the best traditions of the United States Senate, a legislative body committed to debate and deliberation, but also one guided by our Founders' bedrock democratic principles of majority rule.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor on this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 417—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. KAUFMAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 417

Whereas engineers use their professional, scientific, and technical knowledge and skills in creative and innovative ways to fulfill the needs of society;

Whereas engineers have helped to address the major technological and infrastructural challenges of our time, including providing water, defending the Nation, and developing clean energy technologies that are needed to power the American people into the future;

Whereas engineers are a crucial link in research, development, and the transformation of scientific discoveries into useful products and jobs, as the people of the United States look more than ever to engineers and their imagination, knowledge, and analytical skills to meet the challenges of the future;

Whereas engineers play a crucial role in developing the consensus engineering stand-

ards that promote global collaboration and support reliable infrastructures;

Whereas the sponsors of National Engineers Week are working together to transform the engineering workforce through greater inclusion of women and underrepresented minorities;

Whereas the 2009 National Academy of Engineering and National Research Council report entitled "Engineering in K-12 Education" highlighted the potential role for engineering in primary and secondary education as a method to improve learning and achievement in science and mathematics, increase awareness of engineering and the work of engineers, help students understand and engage in engineering design, build interest in pursuing engineering as a career, and increase technological literacy;

Whereas an increasing number of the approximately 1,500,000 engineers in the United States are nearing retirement;

Whereas National Engineers Week has developed into a formal coalition of more than 100 professional societies, major corporations, and government agencies that are dedicated to ensuring a diverse and well-educated engineering workforce, promoting literacy in science, technology, engineering, and math, and raising public awareness and appreciation of the contributions of engineers to society;

Whereas National Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's birthday to honor the contributions that the first President, who was both a military engineer and a land surveyor, made to engineering; and

Whereas February 14, 2010, to February 20, 2010, has been designated as National Engineers Week by the National Engineers Week Foundation and its coalition members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week to increase understanding of and interest in engineering careers and to promote technological literacy and engineering education; and

(2) continues to work with the engineering community to ensure that the creativity and contributions made by engineers can be expressed through research, development, standardization, and innovation.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to support the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, which will be celebrated next week from February 14 to February 20.

As the only serving Senator who has worked as an engineer, I am proud to sponsor resolution acknowledging the essential role engineers play and the important work they do.

I would also like to thank Senators COLLINS, BINGAMAN, and GILLIBRAND for joining me in introducing this resolution.

Just as importantly, I would like to acknowledge the leadership of Congressman LIPINSKI of Illinois, who for many years has been introducing this resolution in the House of Representatives. I know he plans to do the same again this year when our local weather will permit it.

Launched in 1951 by the National Society of Professional Engineers, National Engineers Week began as a way to call attention to the immense contributions engineers make to society.

It is also a time to emphasize the importance of learning science, technology, engineering, and mathematics